

REMARKS

Claims 1-26 are pending in the application. Claims 1, 18 and 21 are independent claims. Claims 1-26 stand rejected.

Claim Rejections 35 USC § 103

Claims 1-17 and 21-26 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Harvey et al. (US 6,519,629) in view of Taylor (US 2004/0210659).

Regarding claim 1, the rejection relies on Taylor to teach “transmitting a message by way of the established communication indicative of an invitation to collaboratively execute an application.” Taylor discloses the establishment of an electronic conference, but Taylor fails to disclose an established communication that is used to send an invitation. In Taylor, an invitation to join a multi-party application is sent from an inviting computer system to an invited computer system. (Taylor, para. 0063, lines 1-4.) Taylor discloses that *the inviting computer* may be participating in an existing electronic conference. (Taylor, para. 0063, lines 5-7.) However, Taylor fails to disclose that the *inviting computer and the invited computer* are participating in any kind communication prior to the invitation being sent. The invited party cannot already be participating in an existing electronic conference because the invitation is an invitation to join the existing conference. Thus, Taylor fails to disclose transmitting a message by way of the established communication indicative of an invitation to collaboratively execute an application. Applicant respectfully submits that claim 1 is patentably defined over the prior art.

Claims 2-17 depend from claim 1 and include every limitation of claim 1. Because claim 1 has been patentably defined over the prior art, applicant respectfully submits that claims 2-17 are patentably defined over the prior art.

Regarding claim 21, the rejection relies on Taylor to teach “instructions for inviting computing objects by way of real-time communication to collaboratively execute a computer application.” Similar to the arguments made above, Taylor fails to disclose an invitation that is sent by way of an established communication. Further, because Taylor fails to disclose any existing communication before an invitation is sent, Taylor fails to disclose any existing real-time communication before an invitation is sent. Thus, Taylor fails to disclose instructions

for inviting computing objects by way of real-time communication to collaboratively execute a computer application. Applicant respectfully submits that claim 21 is patentably defined over the prior art.

Claims 22-26 depend from claim 21 and include every limitation of claim 21. Because claim 21 has been patentably defined over the prior art, applicant respectfully submits that claims 22-26 are patentably defined over the prior art.

Claims 18-20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Harvey et al. (US 6,516,629) in view of Pederson et al. (US 2004/0198403).

Claim 18 reads:

A protocol for collaborative application execution, comprising:
A message indicative of an invitation to join a multiparty application, said message comprising a first portion indicative of the invitation and a second *portion indicative of a communications session number* in a messaging system wherein the message is processed as a request to join a multiparty application session.

(Emphasis added.) A portion of the message indicative of an invitation is indicative of a communication session number. The rejection relies on Pederson to teach a second portion indicative of a communications session number in a messaging system wherein the message is processed as a request to join a multiparty application session. Pederson discloses a invitation to join a two-party game sent from an inviting party to an invited party. (Pederson, para. 0040, lines 1-3.) The invitation message includes information about the invited party and information about the game application. (Pederson, para. 0040, lines 9-12.) However, the invitation itself does not contain the game session number. If the invited party accepts the invitation, “the invited terminal establishes a game session file which *game session number is communicated back to the inviting terminal in the reply message.*” (Pederson, para. 0041, lines 1-4; emphasis added.) The game session number is not transmitted as part of the invitation, but is transmitted as part of a reply to the invitation. Thus, Pederson does not disclose an invitation that includes a portion indicative of a communications session number in a messaging system wherein the message is processed as a request to join a multiparty

DOCKET NO.: MSFT-2827/305859.01
Application No.: 10/691,922
Office Action Dated: June 22, 2007

**PATENT
REPLY FILED UNDER EXPEDITED
PROCEDURE PURSUANT TO
37 CFR § 1.116**

application session. Applicant respectfully submits that claim 18 is patentably defined over the prior art.

Claims 19-20 depend from claim 18 and include every limitation of claim 18. Because claim 18 has been patentably defined over the prior art, applicant respectfully submits that claims 19-20 are patentably defined over the prior art.

CONCLUSION

In the view of the foregoing remarks, Applicants respectfully submit that the present application is in condition for allowance. Reconsideration of the application and an early Notice of Allowance are respectfully requested. In the event that the Examiner cannot allow the application for any reason, the Examiner is encouraged to contact Applicants' representative.

Date: August 21, 2007

/Michael J. Swope/
Michael J. Swope
Registration No. 38,041

Woodcock Washburn LLP
Cira Centre
2929 Arch Street, 12th Floor
Philadelphia, PA 19104-2891
Telephone: (215) 568-3100
Facsimile: (215) 568-3439